



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/686,240

10/15/2003

Christopher J. C. Burges

MS1-1674US

7597

22801 7590 03/12/2009

LEE & HAYES, PLLC  
601 W. RIVERSIDE AVENUE  
SUITE 1400  
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

THOMAS, JASON M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2423

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/12/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/686,240	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BURGES ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Jason Thomas	<b>Art Unit</b> 2423	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jason Thomas. (3) David Sakata.

(2) Andrew Koenig. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 10 March 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Geshwind and Maybury.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant discussed the invention with respect to comparing temporal lengths of repeat instances. The applicant discussed how the claimed invention distinguishes from Geshwind and it appears to overcome the rejection using Geshwind of record for claim 1. The applicant discussed a higher frequency... as recited in claim 1 with respect to Maybury, however the examiners were not persuaded. The applicant will file a formal reply.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

	/Andrew Y Koenig/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2423
--	---